



BLUE LAKE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
MINUTES
Monday, April 15, 2019

The Blue Lake Planning Commission Regular Meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m. at Skinner Store (111 Greenwood Rd. behind City Hall)

Commissioners Present: Earl Eddy (Chair), Richard Platz (Vice Chair), Robert Chapman, Matthew Schang, Cort Pryor

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: City Manager Amanda Mager, City Planner Garrison Rees, and City Clerk April Sousa

1. Approval of Minutes: March 18, 2019

a. Changes for minutes were discussed. Schang and Pryor were absent at the meeting, but were stated in 1a and 3a as part of the motion. Item 1a and 3a should state motion by Platz/Chapman.

b. Motion (Platz/Chapman) to approve minutes with discussed changes. Motion carried unanimously.

2. Public Input: None.

3. Approval of Agenda

a. Motion (Chapman/Schang) to approve the agenda as stated. Motion carried unanimously.

Discussion / Action:

4. Public Hearing/Planning Commission Action: Amendment of the General Plan Land Use Element and Title 17 (Zoning) of the Municipal Code to add an Opportunity (O) Zone that would allow a combination of commercial, manufacturing, and residential uses. The O Zone is proposed to be applied to several properties in the Powers Creek District (formerly Blue Lake Business Park) that are currently zoned Industrial (M), Light Industry (ML), and Agriculture Exclusive (AE).

a. Planner Rees restated previous history of the presentation of the Opportunity (O) zone since June 2017. He noted changes from the previous meeting, which included revisions to items of Commission and public concern such as shadowing, height limits, setbacks, etc.

b. Commission Chair Eddy opened the public hearing at 7:08 p.m.

c. Rebecca Zettler, Blue Lake resident, asked for clarification on the setbacks and the X zone in regards to protecting the trail system along Powers Creek. She also voiced concern regarding the lighting standard of "1 foot-candle" beyond the boundary of the property containing the light source.

d. Lin Glen, Blue Lake resident, asked for the inclusion of a statement in the Land

Use Element that includes collaboration with the Blue Lake Rancheria and acknowledge our shared space with them.

e. Kash Boodjah, Blue Lake resident, mentioned that Page 3, item C, number 3 subsection C should be changed to subsection D.

f. The public hearing closed at 7:18 p.m.

g. Commissioner Platz asked to have page 5, item c at the top of the page changed to state "minimum of 25 feet".

h. Commissioner Chapman asked about the statement of 35 dba on page 8, item 4c. Planner Rees noted that this is a recommendation, not a requirement.

i. Commission Chair Eddy asked the commission on adding language into the Land Use Element suggested by Lin Glen. Commission came to consensus to add suggested language that includes collaboration with the Blue Lake Rancheria.

j. Planner Rees stated that next steps include proposed Resolutions, which he handed out to the commission at the meeting. Planner Rees noted the following:

1. Resolution 2-2019 will include exhibit A – Land Use Element and Exhibit B – Land Use Maps.

2. Resolution 2-2019 includes recommendations for a comprehensive amendment of the land use element, for adding the O zone as a Zoning Classification, and for amending the Land Use Map to apply the Mixed Use (MU) designation to properties in the Powers Creek District.

3. Resolution 3-2019 includes recommendations for amending Title 17 (Zoning) of the Blue Lake Municipal Code to add the O zone and amending the Zoning Map to apply the O zone to properties within the Powers Creek District.

k. Motion (Chapman/Eddy) to adopt Resolution No. 2-2019: A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Blue Lake Recommending Amendment of the Land Use Element of the Blue Lake General Plan by Comprehensively Updating the Land Use Element, Adding an Opportunity (O) Zone, and Amending the General Plan Map to Apply the Mixed Use (MU) Designation to the Properties in the Powers Creek District (Formerly Blue Lake Business Park). Motion carried with the following vote: Ayes: Chapman, Platz, Schang, Eddy; Nays: none; Abstain: None; Disqualified: Pryor

l. Motion (Chapman/Platz) to adopt Resolution No. 3-2019: A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Blue Lake Recommending Amendment of Title 17 (Zoning) of the Blue Lake Municipal Code by Adding a New Section 17.16.111, Opportunity (O) Zone, and Amending the Zoning Map to Apply the Opportunity Zone to Properties in the Powers Creek District (Formerly Blue Lake Business Park). Motion carried with the following vote: Ayes: Chapman, Platz, Schang, Eddy; Nays: none; Abstain: None; Disqualified: Pryor

5. Public Hearing/Planning Commission Action: #025-036-003, -006/2018 Minor Subdivision for Steven M. Wright of parcels 025-036-003 (840 Railroad Avenue) and 025-036-006 (830 Railroad Avenue) to create two new lots. This project is categorically exempt from CEQA per §15315 (Class 15) of the CEQA Guidelines exempting division of properties in urban areas into four or fewer parcels when certain specifications can be met.

a. Planner Rees gave a summary of his staff report on this item, which included a history of the referrals to City Departments, and a discussion of current development potential. It was noted that this development potential meets Housing Element needs. He also mentioned that the City is actively working to update the Housing Element to be in compliance with what State housing law.

b. Planner Rees noted that the project is recommended for approval with the conditions presented in the staff report.

- c. A question was raised regarding why only 3 out of the 4 lots will include improvements (sidewalks). It was noted that the two new parcels would require these improvements and the 3rd parcel was volunteered by the applicant.
- d. Commission Chair Eddy opened the Public Hearing at 7:41 p.m.
- e. Alex Ricca, Blue Lake resident, asked about the mitigation for the “seasonal stream” near the parcels. Planner Rees discussed storm water improvements and that there were no issues present for the area.
- f. Barbara Lane, Blue Lake resident, asked about the definition of “affordable housing”. Planner Rees did not have specifics with him, but gave some general information on State calculations regarding “affordable housing”.
- g. Mark Barsanti, Blue Lake resident, asked about the penalties for not meeting state regulations. Planner Rees mentioned that some penalties could include withholding of funding or loss of local control. At this time, the City is working closely with the State for updating the City Housing Element so we can meet State housing law.
- h. The public hearing closed at 7:45 p.m.
- i. Commission Chair Eddy questioned the reasoning for the zoning of each parcel. Planner Rees noted that the zoning was staying as it currently is, just adding in the two parcels.
- j. Commissioner Platz affirmed the project and the conditions and asked the applicant regarding the plans for the houses. Steve Wright, applicant, was present to answer questions.
- k. Planner Rees presented Resolution No. 4-2019, which includes the conditions of approval from the staff report, tentative parcel map, and approval of the minor subdivision.
- l. Motion (Chapman/Eddy) adopt Resolution No. 4-2019: A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the City of Blue Lake Approving a Minor Subdivision Application for Steve M. Wright. The motion carried unanimously.

6. Public Hearing/Planning Commission Action: 025-101-023/2016 Minor Subdivision, General Plan and Zoning Map Amendments, and Conditional Use Permit for Casey and Stacia Eliason to allow the development of 12 multi-family residential units and 1 single-family unit with a detached accessory dwelling unit. Located on parcel 025-101-023 (No address assigned) between Greenwood Road and South Railroad Avenue. An Initial Study-Mitigated Negative Declaration (SCH# 2018072057) has been prepared and is proposed for adoption pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines.

- a. Commissioners Platz and Chapman recused/disqualified themselves and left the meeting.
- b. Planner Rees gave a summary of his staff report, including a history of working on this project for the past four years. The packet of information was large and included the project description, environmental review, site characteristics, Staff and Agency comments, General Plan consistency, Zoning and Subdivision Code Compliance and staff recommendation.
- c. The project was summarized as 12 multi-family units (4-plex buildings) with a private road off Greenwood Rd., and 1 single-family unit and accessory dwelling unit with a private driveway off South Railroad Ave.
- d. The environmental review was discussed, along with project referrals and reports on agricultural resources, wetlands/biological resources, cultural resources, stormwater runoff, and traffic/transportation reports.
- e. The project was noted as consistent with the General Plan, Zoning Code, and Subdivision Code.

- f. An “upzoning” request is a part of the project, changing the density of the zoning from 1 dwelling unit per 6,000 square feet of lot area to 1 dwelling unit per 4,000 square feet of lot area for proposed parcels 1 and 2.
- g. Staff recommendation is for the approval of the project with a list of conditions present in the staff report, which address the collection of fees, drainage, construction improvements, driveways, grading permits, maintenance and development plans, and mitigation measures.
- h. Planner Rees noted that written comments were received from the Blue Lake Rancheria regarding cultural items, and there was a special request from a resident for the traffic study, which was provided.
- i. Commission Chair Eddy opened the public hearing at 8:14 p.m.
- j. Jean Lynch, Blue Lake resident, asked if a 4-way stop for access onto Greenwood from the private road had been considered. Planner Rees responded that while it had been considered, it was not recommended, and that other traffic mitigation measures such as flashing signage and red curb on either side of the private road entrance has been recommended as appropriate.
- k. Lynch also asked about excess parking, and if that would take place on Greenwood Rd. She also mentioned concern for the safety of the children as they go to and from school past the site. Planner Rees referenced the City Engineer and Public Works review as well as the traffic analysis that was done for the CEQA review and that the proposed mitigation measures were determined to be adequate.
- l. Barbara Lane, asked of the traffic scenarios to estimate the increase in traffic that the additional people would bring. Planner Rees gave an overview of how the estimates for the traffic analysis were done, and noted that a pedestrian/bike analysis had not been done. It was noted that the project fell below the threshold for preparing a more robust, full traffic study, but that the Commission may choose to ask for one.
- m. Commissioner Schang asked if speed humps or bumps could be considered to help slow down traffic prior to the entrance/exit of the private lane. Planner Rees said that the City Engineer could be asked to look into this.
- n. Commission Chair Eddy asked about the size of vehicles that were looked at with the study.
- o. City Manager Mager noted that what is widely seen as a “Bike Lane” on Greenwood is not an actual “Bike Lane”.
- p. Kash Boodjah gave some input on non-standard width of roads.
- q. Mark Barsanti expressed concerns of traffic in the area and elevations of proposed buildings. City Planner Rees gave an overview on plan review, conditional use permit (CUP) review and what the planning commission looks at in regards to proposed buildings on the site. Design guidelines applicable to other areas of the City were also discussed.
- r. Stacia Eliason, applicant, noted that their plan was for quality development of town houses verses apartments, and the inclusion of private yards.
- s. Commissioner Pryor asked for clarification on the landscaping and infrastructure maintenance conditions.
- t. Alex Ricca commented on the width of the private road, and the proximity to the houses that flank the road. It was noted that one of the properties were legal, non-conforming, and that the commission could ask for additional improvements for the safety of the properties flanking the road. Ricca also asked about the General Plan amendment with this project. It was noted that this type of amendment is site specific, not city-wide. He also asked if approval of this site specific amendment would open up for others to ask for the same.
- u. Planning Rees provided clarification regarding lot size vs. residential density.
- v. Kash Boodjah noted that the proposed sidewalk should be called a “walk” as a

sidewalk should be 5 feet wide, and the proposed walk is 4 feet.

w. City Manager Mager noted that the “upzoning” request impacts the current zoning.

x. Jason Cseh, Blue Lake resident, commented that the extra density was a concern versus the current Planned Development Residential (PDR) zoning density of 1 unit per 6,000 s.f. of lot area.

y. Jean Lynch mentioned the history of lot line adjustments on Greenwood.

z. Praj White, applicant’s engineer, commented on how the project was arranged, and the lot configurations were designed to complement each other. He spoke of site visit with City Staff and agreed with the current conditions of the project. He asked the Commission if the applicant changed their plan, and removed the “upzoning” request, if the subdivision could be approved separately. Commissioners were open to looking at that change.

aa. Jason Cseh gave more concerns on the impacts of the private road on Greenwood Rd and their use of the driveway.

bb. City Manager Mager noted that she supports the development of the property, but is concerned with the traffic issues and the high density. She would like to work more with the applicant to find something more harmonious and further address concerns of pedestrian, bike and car traffic, and school children safety.

cc. Kash Boodjah reiterated density concerns.

dd. David Glen, Blue Lake resident, gave some historical background on the PDR zoning and noted there will always be an impacted party. He also noted that children’s safety is a huge factor.

ee. Elaine Hogan, Blue Lake resident, shares approximately 70 feet of the property line with the project site. She commented about developing the area in a holistic way, and not piecemeal. She inquired about the fees required by the City and if they were enough. The City Manager was able to give an overview of the fees required. The drainage and storm water management was discussed. Praj White was able to give an overview of the design of the bio swales and detention basin to manage stormwater runoff.

ff. Praj White provided clarification on the water and sewer infrastructure through the property, and that the new main line would belong to the City, but the laterals off the new main line would be the applicant’s responsibility.

gg. Richard Golebiowski, Blue Lake resident, gave more history regarding the PDR zones and gave concerns on the height of two story structures in the development.

hh. City Manager noted that the two existing houses have needs and commented on the impacts of the project.

ii. After a review of the concerns that were heard, Planner Rees suggested continuing the item to the next meeting.

jj. There was a discussion of presenting the project as two different resolutions, one as a resolution to approve the subdivision, conditional use permit, and site plan approval, and one for the general plan and zoning amendment to increase density.

kk. Planner Rees agreed that staff would provide two resolutions for this item at the next meeting. Planner Rees explained that if the second resolution for the general plan and zoning amendment to increase density was not approved, then the project would have to be developed at 1 unit per 6,000 s.f.

ll. The applicant and their consultants agreed with this approach.

mm. Planner Rees requested that the applicant provide an alternative Site Plan for Planning Commission review to show the design of the development at a density of 1 unit per 6,000 s.f.

nn. The public hearing was closed at 9:54 p.m.

oo. Motion (Eddy/Schang) to continue this item to the next commission meeting. The motion carried unanimously with the remaining Commissioners present.

Motion (Eddy/Schang) to extend the meeting to 10 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

7. Planning Commission Review: Dell'Arte Mad River Festival 2019 Pre-Festival Report.

- a. Dell'Arte has an indefinite use permit, where a pre-festival and post-festival report is required annually.
- b. It was noted that there were no changes from previous years proposed for the 2019 festival.
- c. Motion (Eddy/Pryor) to accept the pre-festival report as submitted. The motion carried unanimously with the remaining Commissioners present.

8. Planning Commission Discussion: Improvements to the sewer lift station along the Powers Creek District trail.

- a. Kash Boodjah brought a model and design of a proposal to beautify the sewer lift station off Monda Way near the soon to be built bridge over Powers Creek Bridge.
- b. The Commissioners and staff reviewed and discussed the proposal.
- c. The Commissioner inquired whether these improvements could be constructed as part of any future development in the Powers Creek District.

9. Miscellaneous Planner Items.

- a. Planner Rees asked the Commission of possible dates for a special meeting to discuss a time sensitive application for the Blue Lake Fire Protection District. April 29th and May 6th were discussed as possible dates. City Clerk Sousa will follow up in the coming week.

10. Upcoming Planning Commission Meetings for the next 3 months will be on May 20th, June 17th, and July 15th.

- a. The upcoming meeting in May was discussed for a quorum of the three commissioners not disqualified for the continuation of the Eliason Project. It was noted that one commissioner cannot attend the May 20th meeting. City Clerk Sousa will follow up in the coming week with all commissioners. A potential special meeting date of May 13th was discussed with the Commissioners.

11. Adjournment

- a. Motion (Shang/Pryor) to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously with the remaining Commissioners present. Meeting adjourned at 10:10 p.m.